

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION N		
09/976,876	10/12/2001	Anthony Rodrigo	NOKM.014PA	2171	
7:	590 07/07/2006	EXAMINER			
Hollingsworth	a & Funk, LLC	RUDY, ANDREW J			
Suite 125	Cauth	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
8009 34th Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55425			3627		
			DATE MAILED: 07/07/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	n No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/976,87	09/976,876		RODRIGO, ANTHONY		
		Examiner	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Art Unit			
		Andrew Jo	seph Rudy	3627			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	ppears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence a	ddress		
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING asions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. opened for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statutely reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailed and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF TH 1.136(a). In no eve od will apply and wit ute, cause the appl	IS COMMUNICATION nt, however, may a reply be tin I expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	<i>i</i> .		
Status							
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25	April 2006.					
•		nis action is n	on-final.				
	,						
· , _	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims	•					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1.2 and 4-62 is/are pending in the a	application					
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>25-62</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
·	Claim(s) 1.2 and 4-24 is/are rejected.						
=	Claim(s) is/are objected. Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
·	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	l/or election re	equirement.				
	on Papers						
_	•						
·	The specification is objected to by the Examir			-			
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac	•	•				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the				NED 4 404/4)		
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the I	-	=	-	, ,		
	, .	Examiner. NO	te the attached Office	Action of form P	10-132.		
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	gn priority und	ler 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).			
,-	1. Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have beer	n received.		j,		
	2. Certified copies of the priority documer			on No			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri		• •		l Stage		
	application from the International Bure	•			J		
* S	see the attached detailed Office action for a list	•		ed.			
Attachmen	k(s)						
1) 🔲 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary				
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P		'O 152\		
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 r No(s)/Mail Date	98)	6) Other:	atent Application (P1	U-102)		

Application/Control Number: 09/976,876 Page 2

Art Unit: 3627

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Newly submitted claims 49-61 directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: The claims constitute independent/distinct inventions. Applicant's April 25, 2006 REMARKS have been reviewed, but are not convincing. However, the claims do not mirror each other in such a way that additional elements are not needed for both, e.g. claim 1 requires no processor as recited in claim 49.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 49-61 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03. It is noted claims 25-40 still remain withdrawn from consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The 35 USC 112, first paragraph, rejection is withdrawn. Applicant's April 25,
 are not convincing with regards to "first format to a second format."
- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Application/Control Number: 09/976,876

Art Unit: 3627

Claims 1, 2 and 4-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, line 3, the phrase "charging elements" is not clear as to its meaning. The original disclosure does not provide adequate clarification as to the meets and bounds of this term.

Claim 1, line 4, the phrase "application programming interface (API)" is not clear as to its meaning. The original disclosure does not provide adequate clarification as to the meets and bounds of this term.

Claim 1, line 8, the phrase "network elements and the charging elements" is not clear as to its meaning. The original disclosure indicates that the network elements are referred to as charging elements, e.g. col. 1 [004]. The claim language attempts to give separate meaning to different terms that are the same element. Thus, the language is not clear.

Claim 1, line 12, the phrase "charging events" is not clear as to its meaning. The original disclosure does not provide adequate clarification as to the meets and bounds of this term.

Claim 4, line 3, "XML" is not clear and its full meaning needs to be properly indentified. Further, the original specification does not appear to support such claim language. Clarification is required.

Application/Control Number: 09/976,876

Art Unit: 3627

Claims 6, 7, "applying the rules" is not clear in relationship to the other recited claim language. Further, the original specification does not appear to support such claim language. Clarification is required.

Claim 8, "filtering the charging events" is not clear in relationship to the other recited claim language. Further, the original specification, e.g. Fig. 10, element 1216, does not appear to support such claim language. Clarification is required.

Applicant is required to clarify where support for the remaining dependent claims 9-24, e.g. where is support for the first and second calls within the original specification?, are located.

In short, Applicant is claiming subject matter that is not defined in such a clear and concise manner to ascertain the meets and bounds of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. The 35 USC 101 rejection is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 1, 2 and 4-20, as understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohn, US 6,031,895.

Applicant's April 25, 2006 REMARKS are noted but are not convincing with regards to Cohn. The terms "receiving charging events at a network charging edge" or

Application/Control Number: 09/976,876

Page 5

Art Unit: 3627

"managing charging transactions . . . via the one or more bridge modules through the application of rules modify the charging transaction initiated by corresponding charging events" are nebulous as to their meanings. As understood, the network hubs, e.g. 12, 14, 16 and network communications, e.g. 18, network center, e.g. 37, server, e.g. 64, and administrative event manager, e.g. 78, along with the other disclosed elements of Cohn, encompass in broad scope and content the network charging edge/transactions and bridge modules. It would appear that though no rule is disclosed by Cohn, inherently the billing interaction and methodology disclosed by Cohn, e.g. Figs. 11, 12, encompasses such claim language, as understood. Also, the claim language "for managing" is intended claim use language. Such language is given patentable weight, but less patentable weight than positively recited claim language. The degree of what patentable weight given is more than zero percent and less than one hundred percent. As understood, Cohn manages the billing to such a degree.

- 6. Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement received October 6, 2005 has been reviewed. Note attached PTO-1449.
- 7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Joseph Rudy whose telephone number is 571-272-6789. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday.

Art Unit: 3627

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander G. Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrew Joseph Rudy Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3627